



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,240	01/30/2000	Bill J. Pope	6056P	3185

7590 11/18/2003

Daniel P McCarthy
PARSONS, BEHLE, & LATIMER
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1800
P.O. BOX 458898
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0898

EXAMINER

TURNER, ARCHENE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1775

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/494,240

Applicant(s)

POPE ET AL.

Examiner

Archene Turner

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 80-122 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 80-122 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1775

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-71 of U.S. Patent No.

6,610,095. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

3. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-77 of U.S. Patent No.

6,517,583. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

4. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No.

6,514,289. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

5. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-57 of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,727. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

6. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,494,918. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

7. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-123 of U.S. Patent No. 6,425,922. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

8. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,787. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

Art Unit: 1775


9. Claims 80-122 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-60 of U.S. Patent No.

6,398,815. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the femoral head is included in the instant patent.

10. Any inquiry regarding this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Archene Turner, whose telephone number is (703) 308-4344. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

A facsimile center has been established for Group 1700, in Crystal Mall I. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier number for accessing the facsimile machine is (703) 872-9306 for all official faxes. This location should be used in all instances when faxing any correspondence to Art Unit 1775.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


A. A. Turner
Primary Examiner
Group 1700

aat